


omitted). If a party makes only general objections, de novo review is not required. See Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1997). In “order to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge’s report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection.” Martin v. Duffy, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (quotation omitted); see United States v. Midgette, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007).

Plaintiff did not object to the M&R. Therefore, the court reviews for clear error. The court has reviewed the M&R and the record. There is no clear error on the face of the record. See Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315.

In sum, the court has reviewed the record and ADOPTS the conclusions in the M&R [D.E. 4], GRANTS plaintiff’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis [D.E. 1], and DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE plaintiff’s complaint for failure to prosecute [D.E. 1-1]. The clerk shall close the case.

SO ORDERED. This 28 day of March, 2023.



JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge